

**REMARKS***Status of Claims*

The second Advisory Action mailed August 3, 2006 states that the status of the claims is as presented in the Final Office Action mailed April 5, 2006. Applicant responds accordingly.

*Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102*Claims 1, 3-5, 12-19 and 23-25

Claims 1, 3-5, 12-19 and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Park et al. (U.S. Publication 2001/0024860).

Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 18 to recite, in part, “wherein all formations of dopant material that extend below the surface are exposed at the surface.” Applicant contends that at least this limitation is neither taught nor suggested by the cited reference.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 18 are patentably distinct from the cited reference. As claims 3-5 and 12-17 depend from and further define patentably distinct claim 1, and claims 19 and 23-25 depend from and further define patentably distinct claim 18, these claims are also believed to be allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and allowance of claims 1, 3-5, 12-19 and 23-25.

Claims 26, 28-30, 37-40 and 42

Claims 26, 28-30, 37-40 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Park et al.

Claim 26 recites, in part, “wherein all formations of dopant material that extend below the surface are exposed at the surface, and the dopant material is converted to a dielectric form selected from the group consisting of an oxide form and a nitride form.” As noted with respect to claims 1 and 18, Applicant contends that at least this limitation is neither taught nor suggested by the cited reference.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 26 is patentably distinct from the cited reference. As claims 28-30, 37-40 and 42 depend from and

further define patentably distinct claim 26, these claims are also believed to be allowable.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and allowance of claims 26, 28-30, 37-40 and 42.

*Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103*

Claims 6-11 and 20-22

Claims 6-11 and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant contends that it has shown claims 1 and 18 to be patentably distinct from Park et al. The taking of official notice in the Final Office Action mailed October 17, 2005, taken either alone or in combination with Park et al., fails to overcome the deficiencies of the Park et al. reference with respect to claims 1 and 18. As claims 6-11 depend from and further define patentably distinct claim 1, and claims 20-22 depend from and further define patentably distinct claim 18, these claims are also believed to be allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and allowance of claims 6-11 and 20-22.

Claims 31-36, 41 and 43-45

Claims 31-36, 41 and 43-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant contends that it has shown claim 26 to be patentably distinct from Park et al. The taking of official notice and the inclusion of Weldon et al. as presented in the Final Office Action mailed October 17, 2005, taken either alone or in combination with Park et al., fail to overcome the deficiencies of the Park et al. reference with respect to claim 26. As claims 31-36, 41 and 43-45 depend from and further define patentably distinct claim 26, these claims are also believed to be allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and allowance of claims 31-36, 41 and 43-45.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledges that claims 2, 27 and 88-107 were indicated as being allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any further fees deemed necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501373.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 312-2204.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

30 OCT 06   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas W. Leffert  
Reg. No. 40,697

Attorneys for Applicant  
Leffert Jay & Polglaze  
P.O. Box 581009  
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1009  
T 612 312-2200  
F 612 312-2250